



3621
41

FORMAL RESPONSE TO USPTO OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 4, 2004 FOR
SERIAL NUMBER 09/852,834 FILED MAY 10, 2001 BY JUAN CARLOS CASTRO

1. The office action objected to the abstract and reminded the applicant of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the proper content of an abstract, corrected the content, and files an amended abstract as a response to the office action.

2. The office action objected to the abstract and reminded the applicant of the proper language and form for an abstract of the disclosure.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the proper wording and format of an abstract, corrected the wording and format, and files an amended abstract as a response to the office action.

3. The office action objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it is too long and does not clearly and concisely describe in term normally used by a person having ordinary skills in the art.

Applicant has carefully shortened the abstract, and utilized terms describing the disclosure clearly and concisely, and files an amended abstract as a response to the office action.

4. The office action pointed out the content of specification that must be met for an application to examined by an Examiner.

RECEIVED
MAY 26 2004
GROUP 3600

Applicant has carefully reviewed the requirements of the content of specification, corrected the specification, and files an amended abstract as a response to the office action.

5. The office action objected to the disclosure as being so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search of the prior art by the Examiner.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the incomprehensible disclosure, carefully clarified the disclosure, and files an amended disclosure as a response to the office action.

6. The office action objected to the terminology used in the application as being so different from that generally accepted in the art that a proper search of the prior art cannot be made.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the terminology in the application, carefully clarified the terminology, and files an amended application as a response to the office action.

7. The office action objected to the lengthy specification, and asks for the Applicant's cooperation in correcting any errors that may be found in the specification.

Applicant has carefully the specification in its entirety, corrected all errors found in the specification, and files an amended specification as a response to the office action.

8. The office action objected to the terms in the specification as not being clear, concise and exact as required in 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the terms utilized in the specification, carefully revised the specification to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, and files an amended specification as a response to the office action.

9. The office action objected to the specification, and points out that a substitute specification in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required.

Applicant has carefully revised the specification, included a statement that no new matter is included in the specification, and files a substitute specification as a response to the office action.

10. The office action noted the use of a trademark in the application, and points out the importance of respecting the proprietary nature of a trademark.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the specification, has eliminated any use of a trademark, and files a substitute specification as a response to the office action.

11. The office action objected to Claims 1-26 as per 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by an asserted utility or a well-established utility.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims, has made revisions to the claims, and files an amended claim as a response to the office action.

12. The office action objected to Claims 1-26 as per 35 U.S.C. 112 because the claimed invention is not supported by an asserted utility or a well-established utility.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims, has made revisions to the claims, and files an amended claim as a response to the office action.

13. The office action noted the unfamiliarity of the applicant with patent prosecution, and advised applicant to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent.

Applicant has carefully taken under consideration the hiring of a registered patent attorney or agent, however, a lack of money on the applicant's part has made that choice impossible. Therefore, applicant files an amended abstract, substitute specification, and amended claim as a response to the office action.

14. The office action noted that a series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

Applicant has carefully taken under consideration the use of singular dependent claims with dependent claims referring to preceding claims, has made revisions to the claims, and files an amended claim as a response to the office action.

15. The office action noted that prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the prior art notice of references cited, has incorporated the prior art into the substitute specification, and files an amended abstract, substitute specification, and an amended claim as a response to the office action.

16. As a response to the office action the title of the invention is amended as follows, the old title is “Unified Real-Time Microprocessor Computer,” and the new title is “Centralized Data Processing Computer System for Broadcasting Second-By-Second Reporting of Financial and Non-Financial Transactional Exchange Information.”